

U.S. House District Candidates:

Missouri has eight members of the U.S. House. District lines are usually redrawn once each decade after the decennial census. This year an additional redistricting has been pursued to gain partisan advantage. These lines might be changed by the courts. We have included districts three, four and five, as these will, or may, be in our mid-Missouri region when the dust settles. In total, there are 25 candidates for these three seats. Four of these 25 responded.

U.S. Representative - District 3

John Fraser (R) (No Response)

<https://fraserforcongress.com/>

Bob Onder (R) (No Response)

<https://www.bobondermo.com/>

Bethany E. Mann (D) (Responded)

<https://bethanymannforcongress.com/>

Paul T. Wilson (D) (No Response)

<https://www.paulwilsonforcongress.com/>

Tommy Holstein (D) (Responded)

<https://www.holsteinformo.org/>

Jim Higgins (L) (No Response)

No campaign contact info.

U.S. Representative - District 4

Mark Alford (R) (No Response)

<https://alfordforcongress.com/>

Heather Shelton (R) (No Response)

<https://heathershelton4missouri.com/>

Scott Vincent Vera (R) (No Response)

No campaign contact info.

Jordan Herrera (D) (Responded)

<https://jordanjherrera.com/>

Wayne Russell (D) (No Response)

<https://votewaynerussell.com/>

Hartzell Gray 3rd (D) (No Response)
<https://www.hartzellforcongress.com/>

G Rick (D) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

Jeanette Cass (D) (No Response)
<https://www.cassforcongress.com/>

Ashleigh Rogers (D) (Responded)
<https://ashleighrogers4congress.com/>

Randy Miller (D) (No Response)
<https://www.randymillercongress.com/>

Thomas Holbrook (L) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

U.S. Representative - District 5

Brad Patty (R) (No Response)
<https://bradpatty.com/>

Brett Hueffmeier (R) (No Response)
<https://brettformissouri.com/>

Taylor Burks (R) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

Rick Brattin (R) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

Berton A. Knox (R) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

Micah Beebe (R) (No Response)
<https://www.facebook.com/beebe4congress/>

Emanuel Cleaver, II (D) (No Response)
<https://www.cleaver4congress.com/>

Randy Langkraehr (L) (No Response)
No campaign contact info.

Bethany Mann U.S. House, District 3

1) Which energy sources do you favor increased use of over the next decade?

I support renewable energy expansion options like solar, wind, geothermal, responsible nuclear energy with an expanded nuclear regulatory board, ethics with real oversight, and updated safety standards to modernize and move away from oil/gas production. My plan includes federal investments primarily in clean energy, a national clean energy workforce development program, and a national clean energy transition plan to move away from fossil fuels entirely.

2) Do you accept the reality of human-caused climate change and do you see this as a high priority to be addressed at all levels of governance?

Climate change is real, and it affects everyone — families, farmers, workers, businesses, and entire communities. It drives up insurance premiums, grocery prices, utility bills, medical costs, and taxes. It damages homes, roads, water systems, and electrical grids. It increases the spread of diseases and contaminates water and it drives food scarcity. It destabilizes the economy by disrupting agriculture, manufacturing, and supply chains.

Climate change is an emergency that must be addressed right away because the frequency and severity of disasters are increasing, the costs are rising faster than families and cities can recover, and our infrastructure is not built for the climate we live in today. Acting now is the only way to protect public health, economic stability, and the safety of Missouri families.

3) What do you see as the likely impacts of climate change upon Missouri?

Climate change hits Missouri's economy in multiple ways:

Agriculture

Drought and extreme heat reduce yields of corn, soybeans, and hay.
Livestock operations face higher feed, water, and cooling costs.
Flooding destroys fields, equipment, and rural roads.

Infrastructure

Roads, bridges, levees, and water systems are aging and not built for today's extreme weather.
Repairs and upgrades cost billions statewide.
Power grids face more outages from storms and heat waves.

Insurance & Housing

- Homeowners' insurance premiums rise as severe weather becomes more common.
- Some areas face reduced coverage or higher deductibles.
- Renters and homeowners pay more for repairs, temporary housing, and disaster recovery.

Healthcare & Workforce

Heat waves increase ER visits and reduce outdoor-work productivity.
Flooding and mold exposure increase respiratory illnesses.

Storm-related injuries and stress add to medical costs.

Climate change in Missouri means more severe storms, droughts, floods, extreme heat, and tornadoes, causing \$50–100 billion in economic losses since 1980. Families pay the price through higher insurance premiums, medical bills, utility costs, and grocery prices. Missouri's aging water and physical infrastructure urgently needs modernization to withstand more extreme weather. Climate change also threatens public health, as warmer temperatures expand the range of ticks, mosquitoes, and other vectors that spread illnesses like Lyme disease and alpha-gal syndrome.

This is not a distant problem — it's a growing financial and health burden on Missouri families right now.

4) President Trump has actively opposed safe, clean renewable energy; primarily solar and wind. He has attempted to halt renewable energy projects, including a huge, off-shore wind-farm under construction with many millions already invested. On June 15 of this year, however, the administration reversed itself and filed a motion of voluntary dismissal, allowing these projects to move forward. Would you support these projects which would provide abundant clean energy, or would you support their cancellation? What about similar projects not yet under construction? Should these be given the green light, or would you oppose them.

I support abundant clean energy initiatives, conservation in manufacturing, and a workforce program to quickly deploy clean energy projects. I have a federal plan to expand our renewable energy options using union labor.

My climate policy isn't just about reducing emissions — it's about building a secure, affordable, American-made energy future. That means investing in renewable manufacturing, modernizing the grid, electrifying transportation, cleaning up industrial pollution, empowering farmers, and lowering household energy costs. I support clean energy policies that cut emissions, strengthen national security, and ensure that no family is left behind in the transition to a clean-energy economy.

5) When it comes to energy, the motto of the current administration is "Drill, Baby, Drill." Climate scientists warn us, however, that the majority of proven fossil fuel reserves—including oil, gas, coal, tar sands, shale oil, etc., on-land and offshore—will have to be left in the ground if climate catastrophe is to be averted. They caution us that we have a global carbon budget that we are on track to seriously exceed. Therefore, they tell us, we need to leave most proven reserves in the ground. Please share your thinking on our carbon budget and the need, moving forward, to limit emissions in order to stay within this.

As an environmental chemist with experience in this industry, I support carbon-budgeting and carbon-credit policies that focus on real, measurable reductions — not loopholes. They include national carbon budgets, high-integrity carbon credits, fee-and-dividend systems, agricultural sequestration, natural climate solutions, industrial carbon capture, and clean-energy incentives. These tools help the U.S. reach net-zero emissions while strengthening energy independence, lowering costs for families, and creating millions of good-paying jobs.

6) In 2009 the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration issued a finding. They embraced the scientific consensus that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions threaten both the public health and the

public welfare of current and future generations. This Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding has underpinned federal actions over the past 15 years to regulate, and thus limit, GHG emissions.

In February of this year, however, the administration moved forward the rescission of the Finding, removing the legal requirement, under the Clean Air Act, to take action to limit GHG emissions. Would you support or oppose efforts to restore the Finding?

In my professional expertise as an environmental chemist, I have witnessed firsthand the transformative power of water, soil and air remediation projects in fostering community health and prosperity. My policy platform focuses on restoring federal funding for our scientific agencies while broadening their regulatory and enforcement authority. This includes modernizing monitoring standards to mitigate or remediate GHG emissions, heavy metals, and PFAS, ensuring every Missourian has the right to breathe clean air and access safe drinking water.

7) What else do you propose in terms of governmental action and public policy to address climate change? Please include policies you'd support to hasten improving energy efficiency and the increased use of solar, wind or other renewable energy sources. Please be as specific as possible.

Renewable Energy, Progressive Manufacturing, Respecting our Workforce with Higher Wages and Safe Job sites: Bethany Mann's Comprehensive Environmental Policy to conserve, make money, and protect our community.

Renewable-energy expansion and domestic clean-tech manufacturing
Lean, efficient, worker-centered manufacturing modernization
Responsible, ethical technology development
PFAS and contaminant regulation grounded in science
Climate-smart agriculture and rural clean-energy investment
Union-led clean-energy workforce development
Re-shoring critical manufacturing and strengthening supply chains

Proposed Legislation

Farm to School Act
Climate Resilience Workforce Act
Agriculture Research Integrity Act

1. Federal Investment in Renewable Energy Manufacturing

Bethany's manufacturing and Six Sigma background makes her a natural leader on issues that impact our economy and manufacturing communities to bring costs down and return off-shore manufacturing to America.

- Federal grants and tax credits for expanded energy options like solar, wind, geothermal, responsible nuclear energy, and battery manufacturing.
- Incentives for domestic supply chains for critical minerals and components.
- "Made in America" procurement rules for federal agencies.
- Lean-manufacturing modernization grants for small and mid-sized manufacturers.

2. A National Clean-Energy Transition Plan

We must prepare Missouri's energy infrastructure for the impacts of warmer temperatures and adverse weather events like draughts, electrical brown outs, and adverse weather events.

A national plan to reach net-zero emissions through renewable energy expansion.

Federal support for grid modernization, microgrids, and energy storage.

Community solar programs for rural and suburban households.

3. Clean-Energy Workforce & Apprenticeship Programs

Union-led apprenticeships in water quality and RECA expansion initiatives, solar installations, wind tech, EV maintenance, and grid modernization.

Federal funding for transition programs for fossil-fuel workers.

Wage standards and project-labor agreements for all federally funded clean-energy.

Tommy Holstein U.S. House District 3

1) Which energy sources do you favor increased use of over the next decade?

Over the next decade, we have the responsibility to increase our efforts towards shifting from fossil-fuel based energy sources to renewable energy sources, like wind and solar power. In May, solar overtook coal-generated energy for the first full month on record. It is realistic, achievable, and necessary to move away from fossil fuels in the US.

2) Do you accept the reality of human-caused climate change and do you see this as a high priority to be addressed at all levels of governance?

Absolutely. We have to work towards reversing as much human pollution as possible while we still have hope of slowing climate change.

3) What do you see as the likely impacts of climate change upon Missouri?

We've already started to see major impacts of climate change in Missouri. Our increased disastrous weather events—tornadoes, droughts, flooding, and heat waves in particular—have destroyed huge parts of our state and put hundreds of thousands of people in danger in the last year alone. Not to mention, our state is home to dozens of species of endangered plants and animals who are all at risk of going extinct if things don't change.

Our state's economy is also inextricably linked to agriculture, which relies on predictable and consistent weather patterns. If we don't work to reverse the effects of climate change, we'll be destroying lives. We've already started seeing increases in the suicide rates of agricultural workers due to financial strain, among other reasons. If the droughts, flooding, and extreme weather events continue, we'll continue to lose farms and farmers.

4) President Trump has actively opposed safe, clean renewable energy; primarily solar and wind. He has attempted to halt renewable energy projects, including a huge, off-shore wind-farm under construction with many millions already invested. On June 15 of this year, however, the administration reversed itself and filed a motion of voluntary dismissal, allowing these projects to move forward. Would you support these projects which would provide abundant clean energy, or would you support their cancellation? What about similar projects not yet under construction? Should these be given the green light, or would you oppose them.

I would unequivocally support these projects. We can have and need a society that runs on clean, renewable energy. The government should be subsidizing the cost of more projects like this. Any efforts that move us closer to eliminating fossil fuel based energy sources should be supported by our government.

5) When it comes to energy, the motto of the current administration is "Drill, Baby, Drill." Climate scientists warn us, however, that the majority of proven fossil fuel reserves—including oil, gas, coal, tar sands, shale oil, etc., on-land and offshore—will have to be left in the ground if climate catastrophe is to be averted. They caution us that we have a global carbon budget that we are on track to seriously exceed. Therefore, they tell us, we need to leave most proven reserves in the ground. Please share your

thinking on our carbon budget and the need, moving forward, to limit emissions in order to stay within this.

We need to rely on the expertise of climate scientists. No one in our government, as far as I'm aware, is an expert in how climate change occurs and what we can do to stop it. If leading scientists support leaving reserves in the ground, I stand behind and fully support legislation that will keep reserves in the ground. The US is the leader in greenhouse gas emissions meaning we have a duty to our own country and the rest of the world to eliminate as much of our emissions as possible. Climate catastrophe is avoidable if we put the work in *now*.

6) In 2009 the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration issued a finding. They embraced the scientific consensus that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions threaten both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations. This Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding has underpinned federal actions over the past 15 years to regulate, and thus limit, GHG emissions. In February of this year, however, the administration moved forward the rescission of the Finding, removing the legal requirement, under the Clean Air Act, to take action to limit GHG emissions. Would you support or oppose efforts to restore the Finding?

I would support efforts in restoring the Finding. As I've stated, we need to rely on the expertise of our scientists to determine our action and legislation concerning greenhouse gas emissions moving forward.

7) What else do you propose in terms of governmental action and public policy to address climate change? Please include policies you'd support to hasten improving energy efficiency and the increased use of solar, wind or other renewable energy sources. Please be as specific as possible.

I support the "Green New Deal" as proposed by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Sen. Ed Markey. We need net-zero emissions and environmental justice. Climate change disproportionately impacts low-income neighborhoods and we have a duty to ensure our most vulnerable are protected, including from climate change.

I would also support a legislation model similar to Colorado's laws on climate and clean energy signed into law in June 2026.* We need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, remove barriers to clean energy, provide tax incentives for clean energy efforts, and protections for the natural environments. Colorado's framework can serve as a great starting point to implement these new pieces of legislation nation-wide.

We need to reinstate tax incentives for things like solar panels, wind farms, electric cars, energy efficient home improvements, and more. It is irresponsible to allow the clean energy laws that were repealed by the OBBBA to continue to sit defunct, when they were one of very few steps in the right direction our government has taken in recent years regarding climate change. We must also rejoin the UNFCCC, IPCC, Paris Climate Agreement, and the remainder of the 66 international agreements Trump has withdrawn our country from.

Jordan Herrera U.S. House, District 4

1) Which energy sources do you favor increased use of over the next decade?

I support an all-of-the-above clean energy strategy that moves America toward our goal of net-zero emissions by 2050 while strengthening our energy independence. That means investing in next-generation technologies like advanced small modular and Generation IV nuclear reactors, alongside expanding geothermal, hydropower, hydrokinetic, wind, solar, and emerging technologies like green hydrogen. We should judge energy sources by their safety, reliability, affordability, and their ability to reduce emissions, not by politics.

Just as importantly, we must modernize America's electric grid so it can reliably deliver power from these diverse energy sources to every community. We cannot build the energy economy of the future with yesterday's infrastructure. The climate crisis demands that we invest in science, innovation, and American ingenuity, because doing nothing is the most expensive option of all.

2) Do you accept the reality of human-caused climate change and do you see this as a high priority to be addressed at all levels of governance?

I know climate change is real, I know human activity has played a significant role in causing it, and I know that means human beings can help solve it. We've already seen what happens when science, innovation, and good public policy work together. When we phased out ozone-depleting chemicals, the ozone layer began to recover. That should remind us that we're not powerless. If we have the courage to invest in research, clean energy, conservation, and smarter infrastructure, we can leave the next generation a healthier, more resilient planet.

I grew up hunting, fishing, and camping in western Nebraska, home to Cabela's, and I've watched landscapes I loved change over time. I've seen drought become more common, water become more precious, and the strain on our farms and natural resources grow. That's why I believe climate action has to happen at every level of government, from protecting our soil and water here in Missouri to modernizing our electric grid, investing in clean energy, and making sure major projects like data centers are built responsibly. We don't have to choose between protecting jobs and protecting our environment. With American innovation and common sense, we can do both.

3) What do you see as the likely impacts of climate change upon Missouri?

Missouri isn't waiting for climate change to arrive it's already here. I grew up in western Nebraska, where Tornado Alley was once centered. Over my lifetime, we've watched weather patterns shift east, bringing more severe storms into places like Missouri. We're also seeing longer periods of extreme heat, heavier rainfall followed by drought, more flooding, and greater stress on our farms, forests, and water resources. Today, these issues aren't just environmental; they're economic and public safety issues that affect every family.

Climate change also threatens the systems we depend on every day. If growing seasons continue to shift, pollinators like bees can become out of sync with the plants they rely on, disrupting crop production and our food supply. As temperatures rise and weather becomes more unpredictable, communities will face greater pressure on infrastructure, emergency response, agriculture, and public

health. That's why we need to invest now in resilient infrastructure, protect our soil and water, strengthen our grid, and use American innovation to prepare Missouri for the future instead of simply reacting to the next disaster.

4) President Trump has actively opposed safe, clean renewable energy; primarily solar and wind. He has attempted to halt renewable energy projects, including a huge, off-shore wind-farm under construction with many millions already invested. On June 15 of this year, however, the administration reversed itself and filed a motion of voluntary dismissal, allowing these projects to move forward. Would you support these projects which would provide abundant clean energy, or would you support their cancellation? What about similar projects not yet under construction? Should these be given the green light, or would you oppose them.

Yes. If a renewable energy project has been thoroughly reviewed, meets environmental and safety standards, respects local communities and property rights, and provides reliable, affordable power, then I support moving it forward. America cannot afford to keep stopping and restarting major infrastructure projects based on politics. Businesses need certainty, workers need stable jobs, and families need lower energy costs.

About seven years ago, I studied the economic impact of the BP oil spill, and one fact has stayed with me ever since. The cleanup alone cost tens of billions of dollars far more than it would have cost to retrain an entire energy workforce for emerging industries. That taught me an important lesson: investing in the future is often far less expensive than paying for the consequences of standing still. We should be helping workers transition into good-paying careers, not leaving them behind as technology changes.

I support a diversified energy strategy that includes wind, solar, geothermal, hydroelectric, hydrokinetic, advanced nuclear, and green hydrogen alongside a modernized electric grid. My priority isn't whether a project is politically popular or aesthetically pleasing. My priority is whether it lowers costs, strengthens our energy independence, creates American jobs, and leaves our children with a healthier country. If the answer is yes, then we should build it.

5) When it comes to energy, the motto of the current administration is "Drill, Baby, Drill." Climate scientists warn us, however, that the majority of proven fossil fuel reserves—including oil, gas, coal, tar sands, shale oil, etc., on-land and offshore—will have to be left in the ground if climate catastrophe is to be averted. They caution us that we have a global carbon budget that we are on track to seriously exceed. Therefore, they tell us, we need to leave most proven reserves in the ground. Please share your thinking on our carbon budget and the need, moving forward, to limit emissions in order to stay within this.

I believe we have a responsibility to reduce carbon emissions and stay on the path toward our 2050 climate goals. That means accelerating our transition away from the highest-emitting fossil fuels while expanding cleaner energy sources like advanced nuclear, geothermal, hydroelectric, wind, and solar. We can't ignore science, but we also can't ignore the people whose livelihoods depend on today's

energy economy. The solution is to invest in innovation, retraining, and infrastructure so workers and communities are part of the transition, not casualties of it.

At the same time, reducing emissions alone isn't enough. We should also invest in restoring forests, grasslands, wetlands, and healthy soils that naturally capture carbon, while expanding research into next-generation carbon capture technologies. America has always solved big problems through science, education, and innovation. If we commit to those principles, we can strengthen our economy, protect our environment, and leave a healthier, more resilient country for the next generation.

6) In 2009 the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration issued a finding. They embraced the scientific consensus that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions threaten both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations. This Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding has underpinned federal actions over the past 15 years to regulate, and thus limit, GHG emissions.

In February of this year, however, the administration moved forward the rescission of the Finding, removing the legal requirement, under the Clean Air Act, to take action to limit GHG emissions. Would you support or oppose efforts to restore the Finding?

Yes. I would support restoring the greenhouse gas endangerment finding because it is grounded in the best available scientific evidence. If the overwhelming body of research tells us that greenhouse gas emissions threaten public health and the welfare of both current and future generations, then we have a responsibility to take that seriously. We cannot make good public policy by ignoring science simply because it has become politically inconvenient.

At the same time, science is not something you read once and put on a shelf for fifteen years. My background in biomedical engineering and constitutional law taught me that good decisions are built on research, evidence, and continual evaluation. If these findings have not been comprehensively updated in years, then we should absolutely invest in continued research and impact analyses so that Congress is making decisions based on the most current data available.

My goal has never been to win a political argument. My goal is to solve problems. For me, it means reducing emissions, investing in cleaner energy, restoring our natural carbon sinks, and continuing to fund the research and innovation that will help America lead the world. We owe the next generation policies that are rooted in facts, driven by results, and strong enough to stand the test of time.

7) What else do you propose in terms of governmental action and public policy to address climate change? Please include policies you'd support to hasten improving energy efficiency and the increased use of solar, wind or other renewable energy sources. Please be as specific as possible.

My earliest memories are of camping, fishing, and hunting with my family in western Nebraska. Those experiences taught me to respect the land because I understood from an early age that our communities, farms, and our way of life depend on healthy soil, clean water, and a stable climate.

I've watched that landscape change. I believe climate policy should be rooted in science, driven by

results, and focused on leaving the next generation with a country that is stronger than the one we inherited.

That starts with modernizing America's electric grid and investing in an all of the above clean energy strategy that includes advanced nuclear, geothermal, hydroelectric, hydrokinetic, wind, and solar power. We should help families and businesses become more energy efficient through targeted tax incentives and updated building standards that lower utility bills while reducing emissions. We also need to restore forests, grasslands, wetlands, and healthy soils that naturally capture carbon, while continuing to invest in research on carbon capture, battery technology, and next generation energy systems.

I spent nearly 16 years solving complex problems in the Air Force and later worked in biomedical engineering and constitutional law, I've learned that the best solutions come from research, innovation, and long term planning, not political slogans. Climate policy should be no different. We can protect our environment, strengthen our economy, create good paying American jobs, and achieve energy independence if we're willing to invest in the future instead of arguing about it.

Ashleigh Rogers U.S. House, District 4

1. *Which energy sources do you favor increased use of over the next decade?*

40% solar 30% wind 15% nuclear 10% geothermal (where available) May be one of the biggest opportunities of the next decade. 5% hydro Small amount of natural gas for backup This combination provides:

Lowest greenhouse gas emissions

Minimal air pollution

Reliable electricity 24/7

Reduced dependence on fossil fuels

2) *Do you accept the reality of human-caused climate change and do you see this as a high priority to be addressed at all levels of governance?*

Yes. While investing in the above energy sources, Congress can take the following actions to modernize and expand the electric grid:

Streamline federal permitting for transmission lines.

Expand federal financing for interstate transmission.

Improve grid resilience against extreme weather.

3) *What do you see as the likely impacts of climate change upon Missouri?*

Missouri is expected to continue experience longer heat waves and flooding that will further stress our agriculture production.

4) *President Trump has actively opposed safe, clean renewable energy; primarily solar and wind. He has attempted to halt renewable energy projects, including a huge, off-shore wind-farm under construction with many millions already invested. On June 15 of this year, however, the administration reversed itself and filed a motion of voluntary dismissal, allowing these projects to move forward. Would you support these projects which would provide abundant clean energy, or would you support their cancellation? What about similar projects not yet under construction? Should these be given the green light, or would you oppose them.*

I support the current projects move forward. I would support reviewing future proposals that prioritize the energy sources noted in question 1 with transparent funding plans.

5) *When it comes to energy, the motto of the current administration is "Drill, Baby, Drill. "Climate scientists warn us, however, that the majority of proven fossil fuel reserves—including oil, gas, coal, tar sands, shale oil, etc., on-land and offshore—will have to be left in the ground if climate catastrophe is to be averted. They caution us that we have a global carbon budget that we are on track to seriously exceed. Therefore, they tell us, we need to leave most proven reserves in the ground. Please share your thinking on our carbon budget and the need, moving forward, to limit emissions in order to stay within this.*

We should be aggressive in reducing emissions by roughly 6–8% annually globally to limit warming near 1.5–1.7°C. This can be achieved by focusing on major transformation in electricity, transportation,

industry, and land use.

6) In 2009 the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration issued a finding. They embraced the scientific consensus that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions threaten both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations. This Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding has underpinned federal actions over the past 15 years to regulate, and thus limit, GHG emissions. In February of this year, however, the administration moved forward the rescission of the Finding, removing the legal requirement, under the Clean Air Act, to take action to limit GHG emissions. Would you support or oppose efforts to restore the Finding?

I would support restoring the Finding.

7) What else do you propose in terms of governmental action and public policy to address climate change? Please include policies you'd support to hasten improving energy efficiency and the increased use of solar, wind or other renewable energy sources. Please be as specific as possible.

Transmission permitting reform: Streamline federal permitting for interstate transmission lines. Establish federal cost-sharing for multi-state transmission projects. Create expedited review timelines. Technology-neutral clean-energy tax incentives. Offer incentives based on emissions performance.

Allow nuclear, wind, solar, geothermal, hydro, storage, and carbon capture to compete equally. Advanced nuclear and geothermal deployment support. Modernize licensing processes. Create standardized reactor approvals. Support first-of-a-kind demonstration projects. Expand federal drilling demonstrations. Offer production tax credits. Adapt oil-and-gas permitting expertise. Building efficiency and weatherization incentives. Low-interest federal loans. On-bill financing through utilities. Property-assessed clean-energy programs. Methane leak reduction requirements. Continuous leak monitoring. Repair requirements for large emitters. Capture gas from landfills and oil fields.